

**Appl. No.** : 09/750,742  
**Filed** : December 28, 2002

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed April 17, 2003. In response thereto Applicants have filed this Preliminary Amendment along with a Request for Continued Examination.

By the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Figure 2 because the boxes do not readily convey information to the viewer as presented labeled. Applicants have submitted herewith a Request for Approval of Drawing Change by which Applicants seek approval to amend Figure 2 to include textual labels providing information regarding the boxes.

By the Office Action, the Examiner indicated the rejection of previously pending Claims 35, 37, 39 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Takemoto (USPN 5,807,177) and under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takemoto, either alone or in combination with another reference.

Applicants have canceled Claims 35-46 and has introduced new Claims 47-56. Applicants assert that Claims 47-56 are allowable over the prior art, including Takemoto.

The Examiner's previous rejection cited Figure 9 of Takemoto. Applicants assert that Takemoto does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Takemoto discloses a gaming machine. A gaming machine chair A and a gaming machine B make up a single gaming machine. See Col. 4, lines 2-4. Each gaming machine is thus designed for use by a single player, that player seated at a chair A and facing a single display B.

Figure 9 of Takemoto illustrates "a large number of gaming machines B placed side by side in two rows." See Col. 7, lines 23-25. While this embodiment of Takemoto discloses multiple

**Appl. No.** : 09/750,742  
**Filed** : December 28, 2002

gaming machines in a row configuration, each gaming machine B still has only a single liquid crystal display and is designed for use by a single player, that player seated at a corresponding chair A. Col. 7, lines 25-27. Thus, at most, Takemoto discloses a plurality of individual gaming machines, each gaming machine for use by a single player, and each gaming machine including a single display on which game information is displayed to a player.

Independent Claim 47 is directed to a game station which defines at one side a player station for a single player, the single station including two displays for viewing by the single player at the same time. Applicants assert that, for the above-reasons, Takemoto does not teach or suggest such a configuration. Claim 47 also recites a game station including two different gaming controllers, those controllers configured to display first wagering game information on the first display and second wagering game information on the second display. Takemoto also does not teach or suggest displaying to a single player different wagering game information on two displays.

Independent Claim 53 is believed allowable for similar reasons, in that Takemoto does not disclose a game station which defines at one side a player station for a single player, the single station having two displays, one displaying game information and another displaying non-gaming video.

Claims 48-52 and 54-56 are believed allowable for the reason that they depend from an allowable independent claim. These claims are, however, also believed independently allowable.

In the previous Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Takemoto taught locating gaming controllers on vertically extending surfaces of the gaming machines B. Applicants note, however,

**Appl. No.** : 09/750,742  
**Filed** : December 28, 2002

that Takemoto explicitly teaches locating the gaming controller (9) in the chair A, and not in the gaming machine B, let alone on a vertical supporting face (not even disclosed in Takemoto) of the gaming machine B. See Col. 3, lines 65 to Col. 4, line 1 and Figure 1. For at least these reasons, dependent Claim 50 is believed allowable.


In the previous Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Gabrius (USPN 5,113,990) disclosed a wager accepting device in a housing, and that the placement of the housing is a matter of design choice. As detailed in Applicants' specification, Applicants' invention is a unified game station which is particularly configured to present numerous games in a minimal amount of space. See Specification, page 9, line 19 to page 10, line 4. Applicants' game station is designed to be placed end-to-end with other gaming stations (e.g. a plurality of game stations placed in a row). The space conservation benefits of Applicants' invention are contravened by the exterior mounting configuration disclosed by Gabrius. While Gabrius also discloses an "integral" bill validator configuration in Figure 5 thereof, that configuration has the disadvantage that the components of the system are intermingle or mixed with the remainder of the slot machine, and not segregated from the other components in a separate housing area as in Applicants' invention. For at least these reasons, dependent Claim 51 is believed allowable.

**Appl. No.** : 09/750,742  
**Filed** : December 28, 2002

Summary

Applicants assert that Claims 47-56 are in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice as to the same. If any matters remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 14, 2003 By: 

R. Scott Weide  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 37,755  
Weide & Miller, Ltd.  
7251 W. Lake Mead Blvd., Suite 530  
Las Vegas, NV 89128  
(702)-382-4804 (Pacific time)